

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,567	06/28/2001	John R. Milton	10010930-1	7963

7590 10/05/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/896,567

Applicant(s)

MILTON ET AL.

Examiner

Rachna Singh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) * | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed 5/28/01.
2. Claims 1-27 are pending. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishna et al., US 6,055,522, 4/25/00 (filed 6/19/97).

In reference to claim 1, Krishna teaches a dynamic content distributed publishing system. See abstract. Compare to ***"a method for formatting a publication"***. Krishna teaches the following:

-A server computer system coupled to a network where the server stores a content file containing a template file for publication. A page builder program that operates on a document template file to automatically produce a visual representation of each possible object and state of the template file consisting of a specification for a web page in terms of object content and actions to be taken on or between such objects. The object content is embedded in the template file or may be a reference to where content can be found such as via a URL. See column 1, lines 59-67, column 2, lines 1-28 and 55-67, and column 3. Compare to ***"associating, within a server, each of a plurality***

of content items with a select number of sub-templates selected from a plurality of sub-templates”.

-The template containing instructions for creating visual representations of objects for the publication, the objects described by content information and actions to be taken on such objects. The viewer program is executed in the context of HTML browser program that accesses the at least one server computer, receives the template and objects and renders the information in the template files for display within each region of the publication. See columns 7-8. Compare to ***“generating an instance file in the server, wherein the instance file specifies a number of content items and associates a respective one of the sub-templates with each of the content items.”***

Krishna teaches a content distributed publishing system in which a template comprising various regions is used to render information for a publication. Although Krishna does not utilize the term “sub-template”, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would define a template as a document or file having a preset format and a sub-template as a portion of a document having a preset format, thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the various regions of Krishna as corresponding to the claimed invention’s “sub-templates” as both Krishna’s regions within the template and a sub-template would provide a skeleton for the publishing layout to better organize content as well as reduce human overhead for page-by-page revision and updating. See column 2, lines 22-30.

In reference to claim 2, Krishna teaches that the content items/objects can be associated with user actions. See column 3, lines 49-55. Furthermore, Krishna teaches that when a client computer wishes to view a template file and makes a request to the server, the template file is downloaded to the browser and the viewer will use URLs to obtain the content and action information from the servers. See column 5, lines 15-50.

In reference to claim 3, Krishna teaches that the request is sent from a client computer before the templates are associated with the content items. See column 5.

In reference to claim 4, Krishna teaches that the object content might be embedded in the template file or may be a reference to where content can be found such as via a URL. See column 1, lines 59-67, column 2, lines 1-28 and 55-67, and column 3. Thus if the object content is embedded in the template file, it does not correspond to the request identifier.

In reference to claim 5, Krishna teaches a template containing instructions for creating visual representations of objects for the publication, the objects described by content information and actions to be taken on such objects. The viewer program is executed in the context of HTML browser program that accesses the at least one server computer, receives the template and objects and renders the information in the template files for display within each region of the publication. See columns 7-8.

In reference to claim 6, Krishna teaches that the template includes a plurality of regions and the objects and actions specified therein, and renders the information in the template files for display within each region of the electronic publication.

In reference to claim 7, Krishna teaches that the template containing instructions for creating visual representations of objects for the publication, the objects described by content information and actions to be taken on such objects. The viewer program is executed in the context of HTML browser program that accesses the at least one server computer, receives the template and objects and renders the information in the template files for display within each region of the publication. See columns 7-8. As a copyhole refers to a location where content is to be placed in a document, Krishna's regions in the template are analogous to a copyhole.

In reference to claim 8, Krishna discloses that the viewer program is executed in the context of HTML browser program that accesses the at least one server computer, receives the template and objects and renders the information in the template files for display within each region of the publication. See columns 7-8. Regions are analogous to sub-templates.

In reference to claim 9, Krishna discloses in figure 2 that two different regions on the template can be of different heights where one height is a whole number multiple of another sub-template. See figure 2, elements a and b. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would recognize that having different regions on a publication page would be necessary when dealing with content of different lengths and formats.

Claims 10-18 are rejected under the same rationale used in claims 1-9 above respectively.

Claims 19-27 are rejected under the same rationale used in claims 1-9 above respectively.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dodge et al. US 5,655,130

McCaskey et al. US 2002/0152245 A1

Sparks et al. US 6,167,382

Peters US 2002/0087594 A1

Bernardo et al. US 6,684,369 B1

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 703.305.1952. Starting in mid-October, the Examiner can be reached at 571.272.4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 703.305.9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Application/Control Number: 09/896,567

Page 7

Art Unit: 2176

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

RS
9/28/04